



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,854	05/25/2000	Albert A. Burlando	P/4593	6265

7590 12/21/2001
Marn & Associates
136 Drum Point Road
Suite 7A
Brick, NJ 08723

EXAMINER

SMITH, RICHARD A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2859

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/577,854

Applicant(s)

BURLANDO, ALBERT A.

Examiner

R. Alexander Smith

Art Unit

2859

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2001.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 6-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2859

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1: "their said ends" in line 16 lacks antecedent basis with respect to the reflective member.

Claim 6: "their said ends" in line 24 lacks antecedent basis with respect to the reflective member.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2859

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes, Jr. in view of Mohs.

Hughes, Jr. discloses a reflective warning and locating collar comprising a support member (the support members 12 around the circumference of the barrel) defined by two parallel longitudinal edges (the side of support members 12 containing the reflective member 13), said edges defining a channel, a reflective member comprised of an elongate flexible web, said reflective member having a plurality of alignable apertures (17) proximate its ends for alignment and receipt of a fastening means (either by rivets to the support, or by ties 19 and 20 to itself), said reflective member (23) being bonded to a substrate (21). Furthermore, Hughes, Jr. discloses that the reflective member is easily replaceable, that alternate support members (rivets) can be used and drilled off for replacement on supports that do not have the support member (12) defined by two parallel longitudinal edges as described above, that the support can have a plurality of collars along the support's height, and that the collar is an identifiability (column 1, lines 13-52 and via said plurality of collars) member.

Hughes, Jr. does not disclose a support member having a web, said web having first and second sides defined by two parallel longitudinal edges, said web having first and second ends, said web having flanges depending from said longitudinal edges, said flanges terminating in inwardly turned second flanges to define a channel between said web and said second flanges,

Art Unit: 2859

said support member having a plurality of alignable apertures, said support member being fabricated from a weather resistant polymer, said reflective members being slidably receivable and retainable within said channels.

Mohs discloses a support member having a web, said web having first and second sides defined by two parallel longitudinal edges, said web having first and second ends, said web having flanges (12) depending from said longitudinal edges, said flanges terminating inwardly turned second flanges (14) to define a channel (13) between said web and said second flanges, said support member having a plurality of alignable apertures (16), said support member being fabricated from a weather resistant polymer (column 2, lines 61-64), and said reflective members being slidably receivable and securable within said channels. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the support members, taught by Hughes, Jr., with the support member and reflective member with the features above, as taught by Mohs, in order 1) to protect the reflective member from the weather via drip cap 12a, and 2) to allow for easy and quick replacement of the reflective member for all supports, as taught by Mohs and suggested by Hughes, Jr.

5. Claims 6-8 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Blackman et al. '565 [hereinafter Blackman et al.]

Hughes, Jr. and Mohs disclose a collar as described in the rejections of claims 1-3 above.

Hughes, Jr. and Mohs do not teach the support being a fire hydrant, pylon or support post, nor do they teach a fire hydrant having improved identifiability wherein the fire hydrant has the

Art Unit: 2859

features as stated in claim 6 and wherein the fire hydrant has a second reflective warning and locating collar as stated in claim 8.

Blackman et al. discloses a fire hydrant, pylon or support post and a fire hydrant having improved identifiability wherein the fire hydrant has a generally vertically tubular member extending upwardly, a plurality of hose connections extending perpendicularly outwardly from said tubular member, said hose connections having cap members affixed thereto and said tubular vertical member having a cap member affixed to a top end, said cap member incorporating a valve actuator. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the support, taught by Hughes, Jr. and Mohs, with the fire hydrant, as taught by Blackman et al., in order to improve the visibility of a fire hydrant to a driver who is parking or fighting fires, as taught by Blackman et al.

With respect to claim 8, i.e., wherein a second reflective warning and locating collar is positioned about said fire hydrant beneath said extending hose connections: It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the second collar since: 1) it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art, St. Regis Paper Co. v Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8, 2) it would increase the visibility of the fire hydrant, 3) it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to position a collar beneath the extending hose connections since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art, In re Japikse 86 USPQ 70, and 4) Hughes, Jr. already discloses said plurality of collars wherein each collar is at a different position along the height of said support.

Art Unit: 2859

6. Claims 1-3 and 6-8 are finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackman et al. in view of Mohs and Hughes, Jr.

Blackman et al. discloses a reflective warning and locating collar comprising a support member (16) having an elongated, flexible, extruded web (19) having a first and a second side, defined by two parallel longitudinal edges and a first end and a second end, said web having flanges depending from said longitudinal edges of said first side of said web, said flanges terminating with inwardly turned second flanges (21) parallel to said web thereby defining a channel, a reflective member (20 and 17), said ends of said reflective member and said support member having fastening means (30). Blackman discloses a fire hydrant having improved identifiability wherein the fire hydrant has a generally vertically tubular member extending upwardly, a plurality of hose connections extending perpendicularly outwardly from said tubular member, said hose connections having cap members affixed thereto and said tubular vertical member having a cap member affixed to a top end, said cap member incorporating a valve actuator.

Blackman et al. does not disclose said reflective member being bonded to a substrate, said reflective member comprised of an elongated web slidably receivable within said channel, said support member such that said reflective member is slidably received within said channel, said support member and said reflective member having a plurality of alignable apertures proximate their said ends for receipt of a fastening means, said support member being fabricated from a weather resistant polymer, a second reflective warning and locating collar is positioned about said fire hydrant beneath said extending hose connections.

Art Unit: 2859

Mohs discloses a support member having a web, said web having first and second sides defined by two parallel longitudinal edges, said web having first and second ends, said web having flanges (12) depending from said longitudinal edges, said flanges terminating inwardly turned second flanges (14) to define a channel (13) between said web and said second flanges, said support member having a plurality of alignable apertures (16), said support member being fabricated from a weather resistant polymer (column 2, lines 61-64), and said reflective members (i.e. reflective tape and lenses) being slidably receivable and securable within said channels. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the support member and the reflective members, taught by Blackman et al., with the support member and reflective member, as taught by Mohs, in order 1) to protect the reflective member from the weather via drip cap 12a, 2) to allow for easy and quick replacement of the reflective members, and 3) to reduce manufacturing and installation costs, as taught by Mohs.

Hughes, Jr. discloses a barricade having improved identifiability wherein the barricade comprises a support member defined by two parallel longitudinal edges (12) wherein said edges defining a channel. Hughes, Jr. discloses an improved identifiability and a reflective warning and locating collar comprising a reflective member (13) comprised of an elongate flexible web, said reflective member being slidably receivable and securable within the channel, said reflective member having a plurality of alignable apertures (17) proximate its said ends for alignment and receipt of a fastening means (either by rivets to the barricade, or by ties 19 and 20 to itself), said reflective member (23) being bonded to a substrate (21). Furthermore, Hughes, Jr. discloses that the reflective member is easily replaceable, that the support can have a plurality of collars along

Art Unit: 2859

the support's height, and that the collar is an identifiability (column 1, lines 13-52 and via said plurality of collars) member. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to replace the reflective member, taught by Blackman et al. and Mohs, with the reflective member, taught by Hughes, Jr. in order 1) to eliminate breakage of lenses, 2) to allow the reflective member to follow the contour of the support member and fire hydrant, pylon or support post more readily, and 3) to improve the identifiability by having a plurality of collars along the height.

With respect to claim 8, i.e., wherein a second reflective warning and locating collar is positioned about said fire hydrant beneath said extending hose connections: It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to add the second collar at a position beneath the extending hose connections since: 1) it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art, St. Regis Paper Co. v Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8, 2) it would increase the visibility of the fire hydrant, 3) it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art, In re Japikse 86 USPQ 70, and 4) since Hughes, Jr. already discloses said plurality of collars wherein each collar is at a different position along the height.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 27 September 2001 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2859

With respect to Hughes: the applicant's arguments that Hughes does not disclose channels is not persuasive since Hughes discloses channels fabricated directly onto the surface of the specially designed barrels for his reflective member in order to be able to replace the reflective member when it is worn. Hughes also discloses using rivets or ties to bind his reflective tape directly to barrels that do not incorporate the channels.

With respect to Mohs: Mohs discloses a support member which is an elongated, flexible web for mounting to the side of objects, said support member has flanges defining a channel that hold reflective members, i.e., the reflective tape substrate (21) and the reflective lenses (20), so that the reflective members (20) can be replaced when broken or worn out.

With respect to Blackman et al. in combination: Blackman et al. discloses a support member for a fire hydrant that is a soft flexible metal web which is bent to fit a fire hydrant, said support holds reflective members, i.e., the soft flexible metal web (19) and the reflective lenses (17), so that the reflective member (19 with 17) can be bent onto the support member and so that the reflective members (17) can be replaced when broken or worn out.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Hughes, Mohs and Blackman et al. disclose flexible elongated support members

Art Unit: 2859

which can form a collar on round objects, e.g., hydrants, pylons or support posts as discussed above.

With respect to the applicant's arguments regarding both Blackman et al. '565 and '567: the examiner's rejections of the First Office Action were directed to Blackman et al. '565, as indicated by the elements cited in paragraph 7 of the first Office action and in paragraph 6 above: i.e., Blackman et al. discloses a reflective warning and locating collar comprising a support member (16) having an elongated, flexible, extruded web (19) having a first and a second side, defined by two parallel longitudinal edges and a first end and a second end, said web having flanges depending from said longitudinal edges of said first side of said web, said flanges terminating with inwardly turned second flanges (21) parallel to said web thereby defining a channel, a reflective member (20 and 17), said ends of said reflective member and said support member having fastening means (30). Blackman et al. '567 does not disclose these limitations.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

Art Unit: 2859

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. The prior art cited in PTO-892 and not mentioned above disclose related collars and hydrants.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Smith whose telephone number is (703) 305-0647. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Diego Gutierrez
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800

RAS

December 13, 2001